



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,474	06/25/2001	Matthew J. Amatangelo	AUS920010049US1	8686

35236 7590 04/27/2005

THE CULBERTSON GROUP, P.C.
1114 LOST CREEK BLVD.
SUITE 420
AUSTIN, TX 78746

EXAMINER

SHARON, AYAL I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2123

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/888,474

Applicant(s)

AMATANGELO ET AL.

Examiner

Ayal I. Sharon

Art Unit

2123

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ayal I. Sharon (Examiner).

(3)_____.

(2) Russell C. Scott (Applicant's Representative).

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Avidan (U.S. Patent 6,158,022).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See attached page(s).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Ayal Sharon
Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Interview Summary

1. Applicant's Representative argued that the Avidan reference "fails to perform circuit simulation to determine timing characteristics." (See Argument #1 in the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form).
2. Examiner referred Applicant's Representative to col.5, lines 35-44 of Avidan (emphasis added):

Central to the circuit analyzer of the present invention is a path search algorithm which can trace every path in a given circuit, preferably in a depth-first manner. Because the number of paths can be prohibitive, computationally or otherwise ... (including SPICE decks, preferably) ...

The references to algorithm, computation, and SPICE indicate that the process is performed in a simulation.

3. Examiner also referred Applicant's Representative to col.6, lines 5-9 of Avidan (emphasis added):

The present invention calculates the delay for each stage by running a transient analysis on the stage, with transistors being modeled by the EPIC Piecewise Linear Model available from the assignee of this patent application.

The references to calculation and modeling also indicate that the process is performed in a simulation, because modeling is synonymous with simulation. All of this is performed in software running on a computer - this is not physical testing of a manufactured circuit.

4. Examiner referred Applicant's Representative to col.15, lines 35-39 of Avidan (emphasis added):

The present invention will generate a grey box model for the circuit under analysis if the user so directs. Alternatively, the user may compile a gray

box model manually. Programmatic generation of the gray box model occurs in conjunction with the circuit analysis described above.

The references to generating models, compilation, and programmatic generation indicate that the process is performed in a simulation.

5. Applicant's Representative argued that the Avidan reference "fails to attach timing characteristics to timing element sets." (See Argument #2 in the Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form).
6. Examiner referred Applicant's Representative to col.5, lines 61-63 of Avidan:

The present invention calculates the delay for each stage in a path, and the total delay of the path is the sum of the delays for all stages along the path.

Examiner interprets that Avidan's "stage delay" corresponds to the Applicant's "timing characteristic" that is "attached" to "timing element sets."

7. Finally, Applicant's Representative argued that the teaching of Avidan in col.3, lines 13-18,

The design engineer need not convert to a device-level model or regenerate a timing model. The engineers can use a gray box block model not only when the clock waveform changes but also when the clock itself changes or when different clocks are necessary for different instances of the gray box block.


Is "completely opposite" to the manner claimed in the present invention.

Examiner recommended that in their response to the Non-Final Office Action, that the Applicant refer to the section of the specification of the instant application that indicates how the Application "is opposite" from the Avidan reference.

Moreover, Examiner indicated that if this argument is correct, it would be

Art Unit: 2123

advisable to do this in conjunction with amending the claims to the "means for" format of 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph.



KEVIN J. TESKA
SUPERVISORY
PATENT EXAMINER

PTOL-413A (09-04)
 Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0851-0031
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/888,474 First Named Applicant: Matthew J. Amatangelo
 Examiner: Ayal L. Sharon Art Unit: 2123 Status of Application: New Office Action

Tentative Participants:

(1) Ayal L. Sharon (2) Russell C. Scott
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: April 21, 2005 Proposed Time: 11:00 AM (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rejected</u>	<u>1-18</u>	<u>Avidan</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

1. Avidan fails to perform circuit simulation to determine timing characteristics.

2. Avidan fails to attach timing characteristics to timing element sets.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on 4/21/2005.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Russell C. Scott
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Russell C. Scott

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

43,103

Registration Number, if applicable

Ayal Sharon
 Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.